



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/846,568	05/01/2001	Michael Christopher Martin	RSW920010076US1	4861
46583	7590	07/07/2008		
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191				
EXAMINER				
CHANG, JUNGWON				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2154				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/07/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com

pto@gbpatent.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/846,568

Filing Date: May 01, 2001

Appellant(s): MARTIN ET AL.

Andrew M. Calderon
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This action is in response to the reply brief filed on 4/21/08. The reply brief has been entered and considered.

(1) Applicant states that on pages 4-6 of the Examiner's Answer, the examiner incorrectly lists the claims which are rejected as obvious over SARUKKAI and GLANCE. Although the examiner lists claims 1 and 4-11 as being rejected over these documents, claims 12 and 15, 16, 18 and 19 are also discussed in the rejection, and are assumed to also be rejected over these documents.

The examiner admits that on page 4, paragraph 3 of the examiner answer should be changed to "**Claims 1, 4-11, 12, 15, 16, 18 and 19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarukkai (US 6,775,695), in view of Glance et al, (US 6,415,368).

(2) Applicant asserts that on pages 10-12 of the Examiner's Answer, the examiner responds to Appellant's arguments regarding the obviousness rejection of claim 1 over SARUKKAI and GLANCE asserting that under a broad reasonable interpretation, he can interpret "tracing logs of client sessions" of SARUKKAI as associating session tracking objects with browsers that access a web server, wherein the session tracking objects include identifications of web pages requested by the browsers. Appellant disagrees. Appellant reminds the Examiner that the "broadest reasonable interpretation" standard must be one that "would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, taking into consideration the description of the applicant's specification.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. It is noted that the limitation of "associating

tracking objects with browsers that access a web server, wherein the session tracking objects include identifications of web pages requested by the browsers." is notoriously well known and obvious to one skilled in the art.

The definition of log file, from Newton's Telecom Dictionary, 1999, is "a file that tracks access activity of a host resource. For instance, a log file contains information relative to those who access your web site. Such information identifies user name, user domain, the length of time spent on each page, and which links (i.e., hyperlink) they exercise", from Newton's Telecom Dictionary, 1999. The information that identifies which links clients exercise can determine the identifications of web pages requested by the browsers, because each link or hyperlink has a URL.

Col. 2, lines 9-21, 43-47 of Sarukkai discloses monitoring the number of documents requested by a client. Figure 2 and col. 3, line 59 – col. 4, line 5 discloses determining popularity of documents as measured by the number of requests, and tracing logs of client sessions includes each unique document referenced and the number of times the documents have been accessed by a browser. Col. 4, lines 18-22 discloses analyzing traces to determine the number of links followed in a client session. Each web document has an electronic address represented in a URL. By visiting a web document of a website, right clicking on the document and selecting "Properties", you can see that the URL address. Tracing logs of client sessions to monitor and measure the number of documents requested by a client of Sarukkai would include identifications of web pages (URL) requested by the browsers, because each web document has a unique URL address.

Art Unit: 2154

Glance explicitly discloses session tracking objects (14, fig. 1) that associates with the browser (col. 2, lines 4-5), wherein the session tracking objects include identifications of web pages requested by the browsers (col. 5, lines 43-55, "module 14 analyzes the log of client accesses to Internet 30 web sites...the module 14 as a **measure of the value** of a site and/or **any URL associated with the site**"; col. 3, lines 10-29, "web site may also be a repository or information source containing collections of documents may be accessed via the web...have a high level URL, whereas the pages on the site will have lower level qualifiers"; col. 3, line 59 – col. 4, line 11, "**ratings of the individual web page URLs**"; col. 2, lines 36-44, "determining the value for individual web pages...identify the higher value documents...measures of quality to more efficiently prioritize which documents such as URLs").

/JUNGWON CHANG/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2154
June 30, 2008